



# Achievements of the Quality Growth Commission

mandates, members, principles, and policies

### **Quality Growth Act**

- Quality Growth Commission
- Mandates
  - Provide local governments with planning assistance, training, and incentives for implementation of quality growth principles and initiatives.
  - Administer the LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund.
  - Recommend Principles of Quality Growth, how to define Quality Growth Areas, and advise the Legislature and Governor on growth management issues.

### **Quality Growth Policies**

- Quality Growth Principles
- Net Gain of Private Land Policy

### **Quality Growth Programs**

- Planning Grants
- LeRay McAllister Critical Land Preservation
- Municipal Infrastructure Planning Cost Model (MIPCOM)
- Quality Growth Communities (*soon to be implemented*)

### Quality Growth Act of 1999

Due to rapid growth of population and housing in Utah, particularly within the greater Wasatch area, the increased costs of providing infrastructure to a growing population, and the disappearance of farm land and open space, the Governor and the Legislature passed and signed the “Quality Growth Act of 1999.” This legislation creates new opportunities for local governments seeking to preserve open lands. The Act supports critical land conservation, home ownership, housing availability, efficient development of infrastructure and efficient use of land. The act applies to cities and counties on a purely voluntary basis, and mandates nothing.

*“We’re just trying to bring people together with a shared vision. Do you want to plan or do you want a haphazard approach? What is driving this is quality of life.”*

Rep. Marda Dillree  
3/3/99

### Quality Growth Commission

The Quality Growth Commission has thirteen members who are appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate. Staff services for the Commission are provided by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget, and partially by local entities through the Utah Association of Counties and the Utah League of Cities and Towns. Though the Commission holds no regulatory authority, it does have responsibilities in three broad areas:

- Provide local governments with planning assistance, training, and incentives for implementation of quality growth principles and initiatives.
- Administer the LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund.
- Recommend Principles of Quality Growth, how to define Quality Growth Areas, and advise the Legislature and Governor on growth management issues.

### Encouraging Quality Growth

The Commission is fulfilling their mandates by administering programs that include:

- Planning Grants (see pg.49)
- LeRay McAllister Critical Land Preservation (see pg.55)
- Municipal Infrastructure Planning Cost Model (MIPCOM) (see pg.63)

The Commission is excited to announce the implementation of the **Quality Growth Communities** program!

#### Quality Growth Principles

- **Local Responsibility** — *Local governments are responsible for planning and land use decisions in their own jurisdictions in coordination and cooperation with other government entities.*
- **State Leadership** — *The State’s role is to provide planning assistance, technical assistance, information and incentives for local governments to coordinate and cooperate in the management of growth.*
- **Economic Development** — *The State shall promote a healthy statewide economy and quality of life that supports a broad spectrum of opportunity.*
- **Efficient Infrastructure Development** — *State and local governments and the private sector should cooperate to encourage development that promotes efficient use of infrastructure and water and energy resources.*
- **Housing Opportunity** — *Housing choices and housing affordability are quality of life priorities and state and local governments should cooperate with the private sector to encourage both.*
- **Conservation Ethic** — *The public sector, private sector and the individual should cooperate to protect and conserve water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands, and historical resources.*

### Summary of Commission Expenditures

The table below provides a snapshot of how commission funds have been spent.

Please refer to specific sections of this report for details on program expenditures.

Revenue Source			Program Distribution	
Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Other Sources <sup>3</sup>	LMF <sup>1</sup>	QGC <sup>2</sup>
1999	\$100,000	\$80,000 <sup>4</sup> \$10,238	\$100,000 \$80,000 \$10,238	
2000	\$3,000,000	\$311,760 <sup>5</sup> \$174,472	\$2,750,000 \$311,760 \$174,472	\$250,000
2001	\$3,000,000	\$260,505	\$2,750,000 \$260,505	\$250,000
2002	\$2,237,200	\$60,165	\$2,037,200 \$60,165	\$200,000
2003	\$482,600	\$39,385	\$482,600 \$39,385	
2004	\$482,600	\$5,624 <sup>6</sup>	\$482,600 \$5,624	
<b>Column totals</b>	<b>\$9,302,400</b>	<b>\$942,149</b>	<b>\$9,544,549</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>

**Total Quality Growth Funds for Six Years: \$10,244,549**

<sup>1</sup> LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund

<sup>2</sup> Quality Growth Commission funds are appropriated to the Governor's Office of Planning & Budget and are used for local planning grants and Commission expenses

<sup>3</sup> Interest earned on LMF, unless otherwise noted

<sup>4</sup> Sale of State Park land

<sup>5</sup> The Legislature appropriated a retro-active rate reduction refund from Utah Power & Light to the LMF

<sup>6</sup> First quarter interest

## Net Gain of Private Land

To offset the preservation of lands, the state has a policy to assure that a sufficient base of private land remains available for development and property taxes. The Commission has studied this issue and developed a policy for the state to increase the amount and value of private land. The Net Gain of Private Land Policy emphasizes four actions:

- Achieve Net Gain.** The Commission recognizes that private lands serving a compelling public purpose should be preserved and, conversely, public land not serving a compelling public purpose should be converted to productive private use. The Commission believes it is in the state's best interest to facilitate the reallocation of public and private lands to best meet the needs of current and future residents. Due to the preponderance of publicly owned land in the state, the state must strive over time to achieve a net gain of private land.
- Set High Standards.** State critical land preservation funds should only be used for the truly critical and highest priority projects, which serve a compelling public and statewide interest. Decisions about the use of these funds must include a balancing of conservation and economic interests of the state since both are relevant to quality growth.
- Build Capacity to Monitor.** The State must implement the necessary procedures to monitor the goal of a net gain of private land and to set high standards for state involvement in land conservation.
- Provide More Resources for Planning.** Prudent decisions require careful research, accurate information and long-term strategic thinking. In order to make the best decisions, the state must provide additional resources for critical land planning and other state and local planning activities. The primary source for conversion of public land to private ownership or economic use is the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA). SITLA engages bi-annually in a sales process that auctions parcels of Trust land to private buyers. More than one third of Utah's current private land was at one time under SITLA's management. Land acquired by SITLA through federal exchanges can also be turned around and sold to the private sector, not only adding to the Trust's permanent funds, but also increasing private ownership around the state. In recent years, SITLA has exchanged 106,000 of scattered state-owned lands for 120,000 acres of federal lands that are suitable for residential, commercial, oil, gas, and mineral development.

*"No one on this floor cares more about private property rights than me. I do know what's in this bill. In every concern I've raised with Garn, he has changed the bill to meet my concerns."*  
 Sen. Thomas Hatch  
 3/3/99

*"Open space preservation is a high priority of this administration [Farmington City]."*  
 - Gregory Bell, Mayor,  
 Farmington City  
 Letter of Support, April 2000

### Commission Membership

#### Chair

Dan Lofgren

*President, Utah Home Builders*

#### Vice Chair

Shauna Kerr

*Summit County Commissioner*



#### State Government

Cary Peterson

*Commissioner; Department of  
Agriculture and Food*

Bob Morgan

*Executive Director; Department of  
Natural Resources*

#### Municipal Government

Lewis Billings

*Mayor of Provo*

Carlton Christensen

*Salt Lake City Council Member*

Dennis P. Larkin

*Mayor of Holladay*

#### County Government

Gary Herbert

*Utah County Commissioner*

Carol Page

*Davis County Commissioner*

#### Real Estate

Max D. Thompson

*Broker, Mansel and Associates*

#### Farm Community

Kenneth R. Ashby

*President, Utah Farm Bureau*

David Allen

*Rancher / Business Owner*

#### At-Large

Brad Barber

*Private Consultant*

#### Former Members

Jon Huntsman Jr

Lee Allen

Leland J. Hogan

Dee Allsop

Kathleen Clarke

Jerry Stevenson

“The Commission has met with local officials and hosted public meetings in every county of the State [regarding development of the Quality Growth Principles].”

Mayor Lewis Billings  
Provo City







The background is a topographic map showing contour lines with elevations such as 7400, 7450, 7500, 7550, and 7600. It includes various street names like Gravel Pit, Selman Reservoir, Lynn Ln, Sahara Dr, Terra Linda, Pandora, Doris Wy, Arcadia Ln, Melodie, Albright Dr, Kayland Cir, Kline Ave, Hugo Ave, Delmont Dr, Holly Ln, Sycamore Dr, 4675 S, Gresthill Dr, Walden Dr, Ribbon Ln, and Selman Reservoir. Zoning codes are also visible, including R-2-8, R-1-8, R-1-10, R-M, and R-2-10.

# Quality Growth Communities

program and partners

**Quality Growth Act**

- Define “Quality Growth Areas”
- Identify incentives that could be provided

**Quality Growth Communities Program**

- Vision
- Definition
- Certification Requirements

**State Agency Partners**

- Department of Environmental Quality
- Department of Natural Resources
- Department of Community and Economic Development
- Department of Transportation



## Quality Growth Communities Program

### Purpose

The Quality Growth Act of 1999 created the Quality Growth Commission and charged the commission with several important tasks. These include:

- Assisting local governments with land use planning
- Conserving critical lands through administering the LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund.
- Advising the Governor and the legislature on growth management issues.

They were also asked to define Quality Growth Areas, and identify incentives that could be provided to communities which establish such areas. After much debate, the Commission chose to refer to Quality Growth Areas as Quality Growth Communities, and create a program for recognizing and rewarding communities which are so certified. This is the genesis of the Quality Growth Communities Initiative.

The purpose of this initiative is to bring state funding for infrastructure improvements into alignment with the Quality Growth Principles that were adopted by the Quality Growth Commission:

- To provide priority funding for communities that choose to be certified.
- To provide recognition to communities that plan for the future.
- To help local governments to do what they do better.
- To direct state infrastructure funds to designees.
- To encourage local governments to deliver services efficiently.

### Vision

A Quality Growth Community creates a responsible balance between the protection of natural resources - land, air, and water - and the requisite development of residential, commercial, and industrial land to accommodate our expanding economy and population.

It integrates multiple housing choices with commercial areas and preservation of critical land. Quality Growth Communities also use infrastructure, natural resources, and public resources efficiently. A Quality Growth Community recognizes the impact it has on neighboring communities and seeks to cooperate to solve common problems while protecting private property rights.

### Certification and Requirements

Quality Growth Communities get recognition and priority for State funding.

- Certification is voluntary, incentive based, and technically assisted.
- A community that does not meet these requirements will not be certified.
- Not every requirement applies to every community.

*"The sense I get in Utah is it has to be built from the ground up. It has to be built from the people. The Governor and the Legislature are trying to set up a framework, not to force anyone to do anything but to make it voluntary."*

- John Fregonese  
10/18/98

*“A Community’s planning decisions make the most impact on potential transit ridership ... A coherent approach to economic development, housing, and infrastructure - safeguarded by an ethic of conservation, is a fundamental effort in establishing an environment that is transit-supportive.”*

- John English, General Manager, UTA  
Letter of Support,  
September 2003

For purposes of certification, a community is a political subdivision, but multiple communities may cooperate to meet the requirements for certification on a regional basis.

To be certified, a community must enact plans and ordinances in the areas of:

- Economic Development
- Infrastructure
- Housing
- Conservation Ethic

Communities will apply to the Quality Growth Commission for certification when they feel that they have met the requirements for certification. Applications will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Quality Growth Commission which will recommend certification for those communities meeting the requirements, and certification will be made by the Commission.

### Benefits

Certified communities will receive priority access to state funds for infrastructure. Currently, there are four state agencies who are partners in this effort. The agencies and the proposed incentives appear below.

- Department of Environmental Quality
  - Division of Water Quality
  - Division of Drinking Water
    - Proposed Benefit is preferential terms for water loans.
- Department of Natural Resources
  - Division of Water Resources
    - Proposed Benefit is preferential terms for water loans.
- Department of Community and Economic Development
  - Proposed Benefit is priority access to CDBG and CIB funds
- Department of Transportation
  - Proposed Benefit is priority access to Enhancement and Safe Sidewalk Funds

Additional benefits are being developed working with these and other state agencies. It is our intention that the “Book of Benefits”, will expand as more state monies are included in the program.

### Implementation

The requirements for certification, and the benefits to be received by designees, are being finalized now. We anticipate implementation of the initiative by October 2003, with the first communities being certified in early 2004.



A topographic map of a region, likely in the Pacific Northwest, showing Selman Reservoir and Fork River. The map features contour lines with elevations such as 7600, 7400, 7200, 7450, and 7400. Various streets are labeled, including Gravel Pit, Sands Dr, Lynne Ln, Sahara Dr, Terra Linda, Pandora, Doris Wy, Arcadia Ln, Melodie, Albright Dr, Ribbon Ln, Kayland, Waldo Dr, Gresthill Dr, Kline Ave, Hugo Ave, Delmont Dr, Sycamore Dr, and Theun. Zoning codes are also visible: R-2-8, R-1-8, R-2-8, R-1-10, R-M, R-M, and R-2-10.

# County Resource Management Planning

program overview

County planning efforts need to be strengthened in three key areas:

- 1) Planning for growth;
- 2) Inter-jurisdictional Coordination, and;
- 3) Planning relative to public lands uses, access, resources, and land management agency plans.

In order for local objectives and desires to be appropriately considered in Federal decision making processes, the county's general plan must be very specific and articulate in addressing the issues that are pertinent to Federal land agency planning and decision making.

## County Resource Management Planning Program

Except for a few notable exceptions, county governments in rural Utah are generally not at the level they need to be with regards to their general plans and their on-going planning activities. County governments occupy a critical place in rural planning because of their role in coordinating with cities and other governmental jurisdictions within county boundaries, and because of their inescapable social and economic connections to Federal and state public lands — and thus with Federal and State lands management agencies. Counties governments also play a leading role in economic development activities, which inevitably affect, and are affected by, land use planning objectives.

In contemplating the planning needs of rural counties, it appears that county planning efforts need to be strengthened in three key areas: 1) Planning for growth; 2) Inter-jurisdictional Coordination, and; 3) Planning relative to public lands uses, access, resources, and land management agency plans.

One of the most cost effective ways to strengthen county planning efforts in these areas would be to develop, and make available, a planning “tool kit” which would provide information, ideas, contacts, examples, self-assessments and other resources that could assist and support county planning efforts. With the tool kit resources in hand, and with the involvement of the regional Circuit Rider Planners, counties will be able to significantly strengthen their general plans and better position themselves to deal with the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

The tool kit would provide planning tools that are specific to the three key areas:

### **Planning for growth**

This would include aides for the development of policies and ordinances that address such issues as land use planning and zoning, lot size & density, critical lands preservation, and the cost effective provision of services and infrastructure for development that takes place outside of municipal boundaries.

### **Inter-jurisdictional Coordination**

This section would identify the various entities and jurisdictions that should be included in effective planning processes, and would identify forums and mechanisms that can facilitate inter-local coordination. It would also provide information pertaining to such things as inter-jurisdictional sharing of services and infrastructure costs, and the legal vehicles for coordination

and cooperation – such as Special Service Districts, MOUs, Associations of Government, ordinances, etc.

### Public Lands Planning

The basis for local planning relative to Department of Interior lands is found in the Federal Lands Policy Management Act (FLPMA), Section 202, paragraph C9: *“Land use plans of the Secretary under this section shall be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent he finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act.”*

The US Forest Service has similar guidelines respecting consistency with local plans.

At the same time, the State of Utah has an obligation to ensure consistency with local plans as it responds to proposed Federal plans and actions through its consistency review process.

These provisions create a strong incentive for county governments to develop appropriate local plans and planning processes as a means for addressing public lands related issues.

In order for local objectives and desires to be appropriately considered in Federal decision making processes, the county’s general plan must be very specific and articulate in addressing the issues that are pertinent to Federal land agency planning and decision making. It is important that these plan elements be identified, and that appropriate tools and language be developed to assist counties in strengthening their plans and ordinances in ways that are meaningful and impactful in the eyes of the Federal land management agencies.

The following are examples of the kinds of elements that could be considered for a public lands planning tool kit:

Watershed Protection / Management	Recreation Activities
Fire Suppression / Fire Preparedness Plans	Cultural & Historic Activities, Sites, Structures and Landscapes
Critical Lands and Critical Habitat	Economic Development (Extractive industries, agriculture and ranching, economic analyses, etc.)
Transportation (this would include access, maintenance, and 2477 issues)	Participation in Federal planning processes (Cooperating Agency Status, etc.)
Tourism (including visitor management, facilities, interpretation, permitting, guide & outfitter businesses, signing, etc.)	Water Issues
Public Safety (Search & rescue, law enforcement, ambulance & medical services, communications, etc.)	Wilderness Designations
	Valid Existing Rights





# 21st Century Communities

program, participants, and  
Circuit Rider Planning



The challenge of the **21st Century Communities Program** is to:

- Prepare rural Utah for unprecedented population and visitor growth
- Create new jobs and reduce unemployment
- Diversify rural economies
- Protect quality of life

The **Circuit Rider Planner Grant Program** is a tool to provide planners and other planning assistance to groups – or consortiums – of rural communities and counties that would otherwise be unable to dedicate the resources necessary to obtain professional planning aid.

### 21st Century Communities Program

In 1998, Governor Leavitt and the Governor's Rural Partnership Office extended an invitation and a challenge to rural cities, towns, counties, and Indian tribes to engage in the planning and development processes that will lead to designation as a 21st Century Community. This challenge includes a call for rural leaders to look to the future and begin to develop a game plan for community prosperity and success. It is a call to:

- evaluate the forces of change that are shaping the future,
- assess community needs and opportunities,
- improve leadership skills and knowledge, and
- develop strategies to resolve problems and achieve community goals.

The 21st Century Communities program is intended to assist rural leaders who accept this challenge.

To date, twenty-seven communities have achieved "21<sup>st</sup> Century" status, 13 communities are at the "Gold" level, 28 are "Silver", and 33 are "Bronze".

Following is a list of the communities or counties that have received 21st Century Community designation:

- |                |                  |
|----------------|------------------|
| • Ballard      | • Lindon         |
| • Bear River   | • Mt. Pleasant   |
| • Beaver       | • Myton          |
| • Brigham City | • Naples         |
| • Coalville    | • Newton         |
| • Corinne      | • Nibley         |
| • Filmore      | • North Logan    |
| • Honeyville   | • Panguitch      |
| • LaVerkin     | • Payson         |
|                | • Perry          |
|                | • Piute County   |
|                | • Salina         |
|                | • Santaquin      |
|                | • Smithfield     |
|                | • Springdale     |
|                | • Tremonton      |
|                | • Uintah County  |
|                | • Wasatch County |



21ST CENTURY  
COMMUNITIES

"SKATING TO WHERE THE PUCK WILL BE"

#### Communities Achieving 21st Century Status

<b>1999</b>	(cumulative)
Gold	0
Silver	16
Bronze	36
<b>2000</b>	
Gold	12
Silver	26
Bronze	39
<b>2001</b>	
<b>21st Century</b>	<b>6</b>
Gold	17
Silver	28
Bronze	34
<b>2002</b>	
<b>21st Century</b>	<b>16</b>
Gold	21
Silver	25
Bronze	30
<b>2003</b>	
<b>21st Century</b>	<b>27</b>
Gold	13
Silver	28
Bronze	33

#### Communities Achieving Affordable Housing Plan Designation

	(cumulative)
<b>1999</b>	22
<b>2000</b>	55
<b>2001</b>	61
<b>2002</b>	71
<b>2003</b>	82

### Circuit Rider Planning Program

In 1999, Circuit Rider Planners were hired in each region to help communities with the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program and to achieve their local planning objectives.

Historically, the Legislature has provided funds to assist local governments to plan by providing a Circuit Rider Planner in five of the seven Association of Governments (AOG) Regions in Utah. In another region, Mountainlands AOG, funds were available to fund half of a position. Until this year, there has been no money available for Circuit riders in the Wasatch Front Region. However, in 2002, some funds were found to help the Wasatch Front establish a Circuit Rider program.

The Circuit Riders assist local governments that cannot afford to hire qualified planners. They travel around their regions, working with small cities and towns to help them update general plans and create new elements to respond to growth, economic development needs, and plan for hazard mitigation or other issues. Most communities that have taken advantage of the circuit riders could not do this planning if they did not exist.

Unfortunately, in the last round of budget cuts, state support for this program was cut, meaning that **currently, the circuit riders are in danger of being eliminated because there is no money to pay for them**. Rural communities and counties are concerned that their primary source of planning expertise and assistance will soon be gone. Staff of the Governor's office is searching for short term grant money to fund this program until additional funding from the Legislature can be made available.



*Community planning activity in Fillmore earlier this year.*

...as of September,  
2003...

Number of  
communities  
participating in 21<sup>st</sup>  
Century Communities  
program (at all levels)  
**132**

Number of rural  
communities assisted  
by Circuit Rider  
Planners  
**195**



# Community Planning Grants

program and projects

### **Community Planning Grants**

- Program overview
- Principles for awarding grants
- Community Action Plans
- Program implementation
- Sample Profiles

### **1999-2003 Benchmarks**

- Total funds appropriated: \$606,375
- Total funds leveraged: \$1,407,325
- Matching ratio: \$1 (State) : \$3 (Local)
- Projects funded: 45

## Planning Grant Program Overview

The State of Utah encourages communities to plan for future growth needs, and to minimize spending of public infrastructure and services. Planning grants are offered to communities committed to exploring the efficient use of land, and the efficient expansion of infrastructure and public services. Where communities share boundaries, cooperative planning between jurisdictions is encouraged to avoid land development decisions based on competition and haste.

## A Guide to Quality Growth

To facilitate responsible growth and increase the return on investment, communities are required to use the following principles as a guide to planning:

- Local Responsibility
- State Leadership
- Economic Development
- Efficient Infrastructure Development
- Housing Opportunity
- Conservation Ethic

State planning grants are reviewed by a commission of Governor-appointed individuals from private and public sectors, who rate planning grant applications based on multiple criteria.

## Community Action Plans

Planning grants have been awarded to communities that have demonstrated a desire to preserve their quality of life and plan for the future. As a result, the projects have varied in scope. Although there is no one right way to achieve the goals established by a community, a majority of the funds appropriated have been used to develop General Land Use Plans. Other projects included downtown revitalization plans, performance zoning plans, water conservation plans, open space conservation plans, and transit-oriented development plans.

### Planning Grant Summary

#### 1999

Applicants	23
Awards	21
Amount Awarded	\$188,000
Total Match	\$297,610

*Funding Ratio = <\$2 (State) : \$3 (Local)*

#### 2000

Applicants	44
Awards	12
Amount Awarded	\$191,875
Total Match	\$625,981

*Funding Ratio = >\$1 (State) : \$3 (Local)*

#### 2001

Applicants	31
Awards	12
Amount Awarded	\$226,500
Total Match	\$483,734

*Funding Ratio = >\$1 (State) : \$3 (Local)*

#### Totals

Applicants	98
Awards	45
Amount Awarded	\$606,375
Total Match	\$1,407,325

*Funding Ratio = >\$1 (State) : \$3 (Local)*

*“Planners are using the zoning and design guidelines to educate and assist developers in projects... We have used the plan to obtain additional Federal funds (\$225,000 in water/sewer related infrastructure improvements) to spur redevelopment. The plan is handed out regularly to developers and property owners in the subject area.”*

Nathan Cox  
Programs Administrator  
City of South Salt Lake

52

*“This plan has helped local decision makers guide urban development away from important agricultural lands and open spaces to areas where services are already available. The Cache County Agricultural Advisory Board has developed the Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA). QGC funds also funded the exploration of various agricultural preservation tools.”*

Cindy Hall  
Bear River Association of  
Governments

## Program Implementation

***From 1999 thru 2001, the Quality Growth Commission has awarded 45 planning grants totaling over \$600,000 to communities throughout the State of Utah*** in an effort to promote responsible and intelligent growth throughout the State of Utah. Communities receiving these grants have enthusiastically provided matching funds in excess of \$1,407,325.

With a 1:3 matching ratio, Utah communities are now better prepared to not only meet their current needs but have plans and programs in place that will assist them in meeting the changing demands of growth in a more cost effective manner. This saves Utah and taxpayers money now and in the long-term. Unfortunately, due to a depressed economy and budget cuts, planning grant funds were eliminated in 2002.

## Planning Grant Profile – South Salt Lake City

South Salt Lake City leveraged a Quality Growth Commission planning grant in the amount of \$30,000 with matching funds of \$73,000 to design a specific plan and recommendation to guide transit oriented development for the surrounding TRAX Light Rail Station (Central Pointe Station) located at 2100 South. Total project cost: \$103,000.

## Planning Grant Profile – Cache County

In 2001, Cache County received the funding necessary to create a county wide agricultural land preservation program. A planning grant in the amount of \$12,000 was matched with \$34,000 of additional funds. Total project cost: \$46,000.

These funds were critical in funding the activities of the Cache County Agricultural Advisory Board and the ongoing development of agricultural preservation programs in Cache County.



## Planning Projects Funded

### 1999

Alpine/Highland-Open Space Study  
 Brigham City/Perry-EU/Calthorpe Design Workshop  
 Cache County/Logan –Quality Growth Principles Survey  
 Centerville-EU/Calthorpe Design Workshop  
 Garfield County-Quality Growth Survey and Open House  
 Layton-Create visual and conduct workshops  
 Provo-EU/Calthorpe Design Workshop  
 Salt Lake City-Calthorpe to design block  
 Sandy/Midvale-EU Calthorpe Design Workshop  
 South Salt Lake-Transit Oriented Development  
 Springdale-Quality Growth Survey and Open House  
 Tooele-Regional Quality Growth Planning Policies  
 West Jordan-West Jordan Quality Planning  
 West Valley-Calthorpe Design Workshop/Jordan River Revitalization  
 Davis County-Quality Growth Survey and Open House  
 Richmond-Master Plan for Quality Growth Demonstration Area  
 Cedar Hills-Master Plan for Quality Growth Demonstration Area  
 Bluffdale-Master Plan for Quality Growth Demonstration Area  
 Salt Lake City-Design of West Temple Gateway Area  
 Nephi-Implementing Principles via economic modeling and incentives  
 Kanab-General Plan Update  
 Sanpete County- Implementing Principles via economic modeling and incentives

### 2000

Castle Valley-Castle Valley Planning Study  
 Salina-General Plan  
 Draper-Open Space Conservation Plan  
 South Salt Lake-Millcreek TRAX Station Implementation Plan  
 Davis County-Regional Open Lands Plan  
 Farmington-Conservation Development Ordinance and Downtown Infill Ordinance  
 Laverkin-Laverkin Twist Master Plan  
 Logan-Vision Plan for Downtown Redevelopment  
 West Haven-General Plan and Community Center Master Plan  
 Moab-Grand County Multi-Agency Planning Projects  
 Ogden-Urban Design Plan  
 Spanish Fork-Nebo Vision and Regional Wastewater Treatment Feasibility Study

### 2001

Cache County-Agricultural Heritage Initiative  
 Davis County-Regional Open Space Plan (Phase 2)  
 Hurricane-Zoning Ordinance Update  
 Lindon-Timpanogos Community Vision  
 North Logan/Cache County-Transfer of Development Rights Ordinance  
 Salt Lake City-Performance Zoning Ordinance  
 Salt Lake County-Bonneville Shoreline Trail Plan  
 South Salt Lake-Central Pointe Transit Development Plan  
 Springdale-General Plan Update  
 St. George-Water Conservancy Plan  
 Syracuse-Town Center Plan  
 Washington Terrace-Weber River Corridor Plan

*"This is a major  
 state policy  
 statement that we  
 are not going to  
 engage in urban  
 sprawl anymore."*

Rep. Kevin Garn  
 1/26/99

